

which comes from the riders of the Metro system.

So we ought to ask ourselves, do principles only apply when it is convenient, when it suits our politics; or do we vote consistently with principles like deferring to the sovereignty of local governments in opposition to unfunded Federal mandates? Because this is what this is, an unfunded Federal mandate. It would not be done in other congressional districts, but we are going to be doing it over the opposition of this local government and the regional authority. We are going to do it out of what I can only consider to be partisan petty politics.

We greatly regret the fact that Ronald Reagan today is suffering from Alzheimer's disease. But I know, and I particularly regret it for one reason because I know that if he were able to, he would adamantly insist the Congress not do this to his name. George Will wrote an editorial making this point: he quoted Cato, the famous Roman, who made the point that he would rather have people asking why is this place not named after Cato, than asking why did they name this coliseum or facility after Cato. In other words, modesty ought to be a hallmark of great people. Resistance to arrogance. Yet that is what this provision is. It is an arrogant Federal imposition upon the will of local government.

Local government did not resist adding the name out of resentment of Ronald Reagan, although they certainly resent the fact that they were never consulted when they changed the name of the airport from George Washington's honor to Ronald Reagan. Because it is on the very road that leads to George Washington's home. George Washington's family owned the land that National Airport was built on. In fact, Franklin Roosevelt, when the main terminal was constructed, had it constructed to resemble Mount Vernon. So if they had been consulted, they would have said, well, we really think it should be continued to be named after George Washington since Ronald Reagan never used this airport. It did not offer transcontinental flights. He used Andrews Air Force Base when he was President. So they resent that.

But that is not why they resisted this. They resisted because it does not make practical sense. You cannot fit four long names, Ronald Reagan National Airport, on the literature. But most importantly, all the stations are named after places, not after people. When some people wanted to honor Robert Kennedy by naming the Metro station at the RFK Stadium after Robert Kennedy, the Metro Board likewise resisted. They said, no, we name them after places, we will name it Stadium Armory, not after an individual. Likewise, this metro station should be named National Airport.

Now, many people will think this is a petty picayune issue, but it is a principle. We voted unanimously against unfunded Federal mandates. This is an

unfunded Federal mandate. That principle should be preserved, and so should respect for local government wishes.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress should reject this language that purports to honor Ronald Reagan, but actually defiles his legacy.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2299, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-110) on the resolution (H. Res. 178) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2299) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE ENERGY SHORTAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to devote my comments to a focus on energy and the energy shortage that we have. On one hand I think in some areas we have an energy crisis, on the other hand I think at times we really have an energy problem. In either case, whether an energy crisis or an energy problem, the fact is we need to apply an ingredient called common sense.

There is a lot of areas of common sense. We can find a lot of common sense, like conservation. Issues like conservation, when applied to energy, can be done without a lot of pain. It

does not affect our life-style. In fact, it is a contribution to our country's energy woes, so to speak. So I will visit a little about conservation this evening.

I also want to address where we are, what kind of problem we are facing in future generations. I think it is incumbent upon us, as leaders, to exercise some leadership not for today, which obviously we have to do, but for the future. Our questions about energy should not be questions about energy today exclusively, but should in fact include questions about energy for tomorrow. Of course issues like conservation and issues like alternative power, solar and other types, wind power, et cetera, are a part of our leadership obligations to help address or at least help prepare some answers for future generations on their energy problems.

I thought it would be very good this evening to take a look at what common sense does for us. For example, hydropower. Hydropower does not use coal. Hydropower does not use electricity. It generates electricity. Hydropower does not require natural gas. Hydropower does not require fuel. The fuel that generates hydropower is the natural flow of water. So we are going to talk a little about hydropower. We are going to talk about why hydropower is important for our environment.

In our mad rush to supply energy, regardless of the source, we always have to consider what is the impact to the environment and how can we mitigate the environment. In some cases, not just mitigate the environment, and in fact mitigation of the environment may be old news, the new news for the environment may mean that we have to enhance the environment, a step higher than mitigation of the environment. But I want to stress here this evening that mitigation or enhancement of the environment is not an exclusive set of its own. In other words, we can have the environment, and we can have power production regardless of the source. In fact, through utilization of common sense, we can have protection of an environment and production of energy resources that every one of my colleagues in this room and every one of their constituents is dependent upon.

Something a little interesting happened the other day. I like to mountain bike. I like to ride bikes, though I am just learning. My wife, Lori, Carey and Bruce are trying to get me educated on riding these bikes in a little more sophisticated form, but I saw someone the other day on a mountain bike and we were talking and this individual said to me, he says, You know, mining is so terrible and the energy companies are so terrible, look what they are doing. So I said, You know what, that bike you have got, that bike you paid \$3,000 or \$4,000 for, has titanium in it. It is interesting to me you criticize on one side but you take advantage on the other.

My reason for using this example this evening is to tell my colleagues that I